THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-DETERMINATION *and* ITS APPLICATION TO IRISH FREEDOM

REMARKS

BY

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 16 AND 18, 1920

WASHINGTON
1920

174457—20714

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

REMARKS

BY

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN.

March 16, 1920.

Mr. PHELAN. Since the door is open, I suppose any Senator may propose any reservation, whether or not it affects Egypt or Ireland. We may regard ourselves as sitting here under our constitutional authority to give our consent and advice to the President of the United States, who is charged with the duty of initiating matters of this kind and negotiating treaties, but it has been steadfastly held, I may say, by Senators on both sides of the Chamber, that we would surrender our constitutional rights should we consider ourselves bound exclusively by what has been proposed by the President.

The President has been criticized in certain quarters for not having included the subject of Ireland in his message to Congress communicating the treaty, or in the treaty and covenant themselves. He was petitioned by a large number of citizens representing, they claim, and in fact they do represent, I believe, not less than 20,000,000 Irish or those of Irish descent in the United States. He was well inclined when he went to Paris to give weight to their words and heed to their petitions, but when he arrived there he found, as he found in many other instances, that the work which had been by the fortunes of war carved out for him related only to the countries which, by reason of the war, had been opened to the consideration of the peace conference—that is, enemy territory. The conference confined itself, therefore, to those countries which necessarily excluded Ireland, because Ireland was a part of Great Britain and was regarded with Great Britain as one of the Allies. New States and new governments were to be carved out of enemy territory only.

Mr. KING. Would it interrupt the Senator if I should propound a question?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I do not know that I understand exactly the position of the Senator, but as I interpret it, it is that we may with propriety, when we are discussing whether we shall ratify the treaty or not, append as a reservation that one of the Provinces of Great Britain or one of her possessions should have the right of self-determination and should have independence and liberty. If that view be correct, then the Senator must take the position, if I understand him, that Great Britain or France or any other signatory power to the treaty could adopt the treaty with reservations that they ratified the treaty upon the express understanding that the United States liberated Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico immediately, or at the close of the war gave to them independence.

Does the Senator think that if we had a treaty before us that contained reservations by France, Great Britain, and Italy, in which it was stated that they interpreted the treaty that the United States should at the close of the war give independence to each of the Territories I have mentioned—Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands—we would even permit the treaty to be read? Would we not regard it as an insult and refuse to consider it?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desired first to make an historical statement, but I will answer the Senator. The President went to Paris with his 14 points. The Paris conference approved the 14 points, England making the single reservation, not with respect to Egypt or to Ireland, but as to the freedom of the seas. She joined with the other Allies in declaring that, with the exception of the freedom of the seas, she approved the 14 points.

What is the essence of the 14 points? On the 4th of July, 1917, at the tomb of Washington, the President declared that the essence of the 14 points could be epitomized in these words: "The reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

The President is very careful in his choice of words, and there was much significance in his saying "the organized opinion of mankind." He went to Paris to see that the opinion of mankind was organized; that it was not a mere sentiment; that it was not the mere expression of an ideal; but that it was something which might be reduced in the deliberations of the conference to concrete form, and that wherever nations asked for self-determination it should be competent for the conference to consider the request. His original draft of article 10 proves this.

At the conference, because Great Britain held Ireland and Egypt in subjection and contemplated the larceny of Persia, and because France had her colonial possessions, and Japan had Formosa and Korea, Great Britain and the other powers did not acquiesce in his draft and gave us something else. When it came to the question of according self-determination to the small countries as contradistinguished from the cases of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Jugo-Slavia, the political necessities of the powers called a halt; but it can not be said that we are excluded from the consideration of these matters even now, since the Senator from Massachusetts has opened the door.

Suppose, however, the conference did say that Ireland should be given independence; that the Philippines should be given independence; that Hawaii should be given independence; and that Porto Rico should be given independence; it would always be provided those countries asked for independence. Then it would be a matter of judgment whether independence should be granted to-day or to-morrow; and if the conference had acted alike with respect to Great Britain and France and the United States, no exception could be made by this country, and the great purpose of the President would have been attained.

In addressing the plenary council January 25, 1919, President Wilson said:

174457—20714

We are here to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters and govern its own destinies, not as we wish but as they wish.
We are to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of a small coterie of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were aggressions of great powers upon small. Those foundations were the holding together of empires of unwilling subjects by the duress of arms.
And nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace.

I do not believe that under the 14 points or under the doctrine enunciated by the President the United States would refuse to consider, in the face of an insistent demand from communities like the Philippines or like Hawaii, the granting of a greater measure of independence; in fact, since I have been in the Senate, within the last four years, the question has been debated whether the Philippines should not be given their independence; and it was refused, not in the face of active opposition, but only because there was no real sentiment in the Philippine Islands for independence, and because their capable statesmen did not consider their people fully prepared for self-government. A commission was recently sent here from the Philippines. While they are seeking nominal independence, they realize that every act of the United States since the acquisition of that territory has been directed to qualifying the people to govern themselves; and they now, in a large measure, do govern themselves in both houses of their legislature and in the commission which is formed by the grace of the statutes of the United States.

Cuba was actually given independence after the conquest by the United States, but I do not think that we would have felt it was an insult had we not given to Cuba her independence and had the conference under such circumstances, as I have stated, suggested to the United States and to Great Britain, Japan, and France: "Grant these people independence, because they seek independence with a burning patriotism; and, furthermore, they are qualified to govern themselves." The suggestion is on the lines of what we have already done; but what of the other powers?

Therefore, when the Senator from Tennessee introduces a resolution stating that it is the understanding of the Senate that Ireland, being qualified to govern herself, should be given self-government, there is nothing offensive, except it be an offense that we have limited our expression to Ireland, though the Senator from Oklahoma includes in a mild reservation Egypt. We might include Korea. The same principle is involved in each case, the only difference being in the degree of preparation which the several people have for independence. It might be quite competent for this treaty, "with and by the consent of the Senate," to advise that until the people show more capacity for self-government independence should be withheld. That would not be in the interest of the selfish greed of this country or any other country, but in the interest of the people whom we seek to benefit.

The people of Hawaii are going to come to Congress and ask that their measure of independence be curtailed. Why? Because aliens have invaded that country, with, unfortunately, the consent and knowledge of the United States, until the native and white population has been overwhelmed, and they will

174457—20714

make that request, perhaps for a commission form of government, not because they do not love the measure of independence which they enjoy, but because they see a necessity of curtailing their independence in order to preserve their native population and the white population which has gone there to establish Western civilization.

So each case, for these reasons, sir, must be judged by itself.

There is no question that the policy of the United States has always been to hold out an encouraging hand to nations struggling for independence. That has been a cardinal principle of the United States from its very foundation. It would not claim anything for itself in Revolutionary days which it would not be willing to accord to others. When the question of Grecian independence was brought up we supported Greece; when Kossuth set up a republic carved out of Hungary we supported Kossuth, and, notwithstanding the fact that his government was brutally crushed by Austrian tyranny, we still helped him on his way across the ocean on a warship of the United States and gave him an official reception in the House of Representatives, welcoming him to the land of the free and congratulating him upon his patriotic struggle.

Our record is perfectly clear as a nation. We are not in any sense seeking our own national self-benefit; nor are we in any sense an aggressive nation. The countries to which the Senator has referred—Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines—fell into our lap; Hawaii came in on her own motion; but, unlike other countries, the acquisition of territory has never been the purpose of the United States in going to war. Therefore we are in an excellent position in the Senate of the United States, in advising and consenting, if you please, to this treaty, to say at this time that the protectorate which England has forced upon Egypt, that land of ancient renown, shall not result in the permanent acquisition of Egypt. The Egyptians demand their independence, and it would ill become the United States, in the light of our traditional history and our established policy, to stand in the way of Egyptian autonomy.

I do not know how capable they are for self-government, but I know that the Egyptian lamb is exposed in that instance to the wolf. I know the Persian lamb is exposed to the wolf; I know that the Irish lamb has been devoured by the wolf. When, by British corruption, the Irish Parliament in the last century was destroyed and it was called "the act of union," Lord Byron said, "Yes; it was the union of the wolf and its victim." That is the history of the destruction of the Irish Parliament which a gallant race set up and which subsisted for 16 years, developing great statesmen like Curran and Grattan, and restoring Irish industries and prosperity to a happy people.

England dared not to stop it at that time because she was engaged in foreign wars and the Irish were fired by the love of freedom existing in America to the establishment of which they had contributed so much; but as soon as England had withdrawn from her foreign entanglements she did not invade Ireland with her armies, as she is doing to-day, because that is bad international manners; she simply sent a horde of agents under Lord Castlereagh, and, by the use of what in that time

174457—20714

was a great sum of money, $5,500,000, the generous bestowal of decorations and baronetcies and earldoms corrupted that parliament, which was a fairly good parliament, although elected under a restricted franchise, and in which the Catholic representatives of that Catholic country were not permitted to sit. But these great men who were developed by that parliament—Grattan and Curran and the others—had a united country behind them. There was and is no religious question in the demand for freedom. The people of all faiths and all creeds and all conditions supported the Irish Parliament. It was united in sentiment; and since that time things have gone from bad to worse. England then and now fomented discord. England made promises and betrayed them; and at the very beginning of this war, it may be recalled, that England promised Ireland home rule, and that John Redmond, the leader of the Irish people, representing the Nationalists in Parliament, who held the balance of power, accepted the tender of home rule for Ireland, and urged the people to enlist in the war, and 160,000 Irishmen, under the exhortations of their own leader, entered the lists of the British Army, to fight for what? Greater power for Great Britain? The enslavement of peoples overseas in India, and in Egypt, and in Persia? The broadening of the British Empire? The glory and the greatness of "perfidious Albion"? Not at all. They entered the war because they believed that as a result of it, pursuant to an official promise, they would enjoy a measure of home rule, and even that was perfidiously denied them. The best English statesmen, like Asquith, declared that England's conduct was unpardonable, just as in another generation Gladstone had declared that the crimes of England against Ireland had no parallel in the history of Christendom. Then the Irish people rebelled at Easter of 1916, and they gave their lives for what they believed to be their national interests and rights, and they have persistently and without compromise since that time demanded, not a measure of home rule, but their independence.

Why should a people capable of self-government, demonstrated throughout the world, be subjected to English domination, which has been expressed in all the years with so much brutality? Their own man, John Ruskin, said that "The Irish are a witty and an affectionate people, and can not be ruled by the witless and the heartless." There is such a wide margin of difference between these people that Ireland will never accept government from England. She might from the United States, because there is an entente which can not be destroyed between the land of the free and Ireland, struggling for freedom; but she will not accept from England now any paltry measure of home rule, as it involves economic exploitation.

She demands her independence; and I have thought, and have voted with my convictions, that under the League of Nations England, no longer fearsome of aggression from the outside by which Ireland might be used as a base of supplies and operations, would give Ireland her independence if she had an assurance of that kind, and that was a strong argument for article 10—that England would not consider herself exposed if the united powers would prevent aggression against her or her overseas possessions. But Irish autonomy should have first been guar-

174457—20714

anteed. On the other hand, the Irish, under their leaders, take the ground that if the powers committed themselves to prevent aggression under article 10 against Great Britain it would be impossible to get the material assistance of any other country in order to effectuate Irish independence. But England is quite capable, by reason of her superior strength, of holding Ireland in subjection, and it is really immaterial whether she is backed up by the other Allies or not, and hence it was not so much a matter of concern for Ireland as Ireland believed; but Ireland did not desire to see the world and the League of Nations committed to a proposition by which she would be cut off forever, as she thought, from external aid.

Ireland is capable of self-government, and she has already self-determined her self-government. She has made her case in the tribunal of the world; and what has been the answer of England? A brutal refusal. At a time when self-determination is supposed to be the approved idea of the League of Nations, in a campaign led by the United States for the freedom of the peoples of the world, many of them enjoying it either now or in immediate prospect—as Poland and Czechoslovakia and Jugo-Slavia, for instance—what is the position of Ireland? The soldiery of England, seventy or eighty thousand, and a constabulary of 12,000, is holding Ireland in the grip of war when we are told there is no war.

It is rather a melancholy prospect for a league of peace to find that while we are debating it one of the most worthy countries in the world, which has contributed so much to American greatness and prosperity in peace and war, is held in martial rule, and held in martial rule because the people, inspired by the principles of the United States, have risen in rebellion against a heartless and oppressive Government. That is their only fault.

I had the pleasure within the last few weeks of meeting Sir Horace Plunkett. He is a great Irishman, but not a politician. He never took part in Irish political affairs except when he was called to preside at a convention of all Ireland to determine the question of Irish government; and when he proposed that Ireland should have fiscal control over her affairs, which is the very essence of sovereignty, the Government rejected the plan.

Now, he comes forward with some other propositions with which I am not familiar; but he told me that the home-rule bill, proposed but a short time ago, within the last two weeks, by Lloyd-George, the premier of Great Britain, should be laughed out of court; and in a public speech he has since stated that it was absolutely without merit, and that is the empty shell which Great Britain is now presenting to Ireland and which she scornfully rejects. I believe he has a proposal to give Ireland her independent government very much as we have given Cuba her independent government, and that there will be a dim protectorate over it, nothing that warranted interference from day to day but only in the event that there was disorder or civil war that there would be intervention. I do not know that that is acceptable to the Irish, but I believe that is the idea of Sir Horace Plunkett. On the other hand, the leader of the Irish, de Valera, stands for independence; but he, according to the press

of New York, listened to the Plunkett proposal and hence there is some division in the ranks of those who are leading Ireland on her way to greater freedom. That, however, is a difference between friends; but the Lloyd-George proposal never shall be accepted with the consent of the Irish leaders. Therefore at this moment the fate of Ireland is in the balance, and if the Senate of the United States, pursuant to the traditional policy of this Government, should express sympathy with the struggle of the Irish people for freedom then and in that event Ireland might possibly be able to win from reluctant Britain a concession which would substantially amount to independence, and, winning such a concession, it would be the stepping-stone to full and complete sovereignty some day, sooner or later, just as Cuba has earned it by her exemplary conduct during the last 10 years, showing a real capacity to take care of her own affairs, and she necessarily has a very friendly regard for the United States. She does not resent the operation of the Platt amendment. On the contrary, she regards it as an additional protection; and if England had treated Ireland with the same frankness and accorded her the same independence I am sure that Ireland would have looked upon England in a very different light, and the English fleet would not only be there to protect England but to protect Ireland against external aggression, and England would be the natural market for the enormous production of Ireland, which goes far to feed the British people.

The thing is easy of solution. We are not doing violence to Great Britain when we propose it. The greatest minds in Great Britain to-day, as well as in Ireland, believe that it would be better for both countries if Ireland were free; but there is no question that Ireland will some day be free, for, rely upon it, the lovers of freedom will be free, and no one can question the love of the Irish for freedom. It is not a holiday parade. She has given martyrs in every generation, and she has had to show her passports throughout the world at every crossroads. She has not been abashed by temporary defeat. She has gone right ahead steadfastly and has never been turned from her purpose; and—

> There never yet was human power
> Which could evade, if unforgiven,
> The patient search and vigil long
> Of him who treasures up a wrong.

March 18, 1920.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, while I am in cordial sympathy with the reservation proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], still I look with much misgivings upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to strike out the line which says that the United States adheres to the principle of self-determination.

There is no question but that nothing more reactionary could be proposed—and I was surprised that it should have come from the State of Massachusetts—than to strike out the declaration which seems to be the common law of the world to-day, the principle of self-determination. It is the very prin-

ciple which gave us our national existence, and even Englishmen were the severest critics of those who stood in the way. Lord Chatham, you will recall, said if he were an American as he was an Englishman, so long as a British troop remained in this country never would he lay down his arms. The principle of self-determination has been ingrained in the Anglo-Saxon race, so called, and it is only a matter of time and method when it shall be given to Ireland; and here the Senate of the United States contemplates striking out from a reservation a matter of such common acceptance as the principle of self-determination.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator think that the United States adheres to the principle of self-determination?

Mr. PHELAN. The policy of the United States recognizes that principle, I believe, in most of its public acts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator agree to that principle being recognized in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator agrees that the Hawaiian Islands by their own self-determination joined the United States. I do not see why the question should be raised, as there is no question of that kind, that Hawaii wishes to withdraw from the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Might it not be raised in the future?

Mr. PHELAN. If the Senator will anticipate all questions and expect a categorical answer, he will keep me very busy; but the Hawaiian Islands are a Territory of the United States, which is to all intents and purposes the fullest expression under our law of self-determination. Hawaii has the protection of the United States by land and sea and she has the right to pass domestic legislation. What more could she want?

Mr. WADSWORTH. She might want independence.

Mr. PHELAN. Well, if she asks for it, we will consider it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no further questions to ask.

Mr. PHELAN. And if we deny independence to the Hawaiian Islands when Hawaii makes application for it on just grounds—that our law is oppressive and inimical to her interests; that it is destructive of her native population and against the welfare and well-being of the people—I do not see how the United States could hesitate to cure the situation. She would give them such a measure of independence, perhaps, as the United States voluntarily gave Cuba, holding under the Platt amendment that in case there was disorder or civil war, or perhaps external aggression menacing our coasts, we would intervene, but that during those days of peace and quiet Hawaii would enjoy the same independence under such circumstances as Cuba now enjoys; and we do not begrudge to Cuba that independence. She is as much a part of the United States as though she were a Territory of the United States for all legitimate and defensive purposes.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. WADSWORTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Since the Senator has explained so luminously the doctrine of self-determination as applied to Hawaii, I wish he would explain to us on what doctrine of self-determination we fought the South for four years?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the United States is one country, and the men of the South were as much a part of the American people as the men of the North. Unlike Ireland, they came into the Union of their own motion, and they claimed that under the Constitution, as they interpreted it, they could go out of their own motion. That was disputed, so it became, not a revolution, but a rebellion, and it was one of those things that had to be settled by the arbitrament of the sword. It was the moral issue of slavery. There was no other tribunal to which appeal could be made; but I do not think there is any parallel between the principle of self-determination as applied to a great section of the country as to the South or the East or the West, and as applied to countries that have a nationality and a history and traditions of their own, that are racially different, as in the case of Ireland and England. There can be no possible parallel. In America we are a homogeneous family, and if we have a family quarrel, that is our own affair. The Supreme Court has held this is "an indestructible Union of indestructible States."

Mr. LODGE and Mr. OWEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PHELAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his explanation. It is quite perfect.

Mr. PHELAN. I am glad that the Senator accepts it.

Mr. LODGE. I see now that the South did not want to go; that it had no racial or traditional history; that it did not have within its borders the oldest colony; and that it had self-determination, though it cost us four years of savage war to prevent its having self-determination.

Mr. PHELAN. But the Senator does not pretend to say that there is any parallel between the relations between the North and the South and the relations between England and Ireland?

Mr. LODGE. It is not a question of parallel. Either the self-determination is always applicable, or it is only sometimes applicable, when we happen to feel like it.

Mr. PHELAN. I am referring now to the self-determination of nations. The United States self-determined, not by decree, but by the arbitrament of the sword, in that instance. It is now recognized as the accepted verdict beyond recall.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PHELAN. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to suggest to the Senator from California that he has in support of his argument generally the very important fact that at the time of the Civil War the necessity of the States of the Union being cohered together in the Union was a vital question, affecting the protection of the whole of the American Continent; that if the States at that time had been

174457—20714

divided, and the Union destroyed, they would have been open to the attack of the military dynasties of Europe, and therefore the intuition of the American people was against such a separation. That matter is no longer of force, because the nations of the world are now democratic; the nations of the world have recognized that government ought to be based upon the consent of the governed; so that the premises are changed, and the Senator from California may well take that into account.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I enjoy what the Senator has said, but he has encroached upon my time.

I merely desire to emphasize the fact that this Government has steadfastly maintained from its very inception the principle of self-determination. It is, in fact, that very principle that gave it its birth; and if, even by implication, there is a repudiation here to-day of that principle, I think it is a matter of such a serious character that it should be understood.

The President went to Paris armed with an article to be inserted in the covenant of the league in which this principle was put in a most practical form. The words are as follows:

> The contracting powers unite in guaranteeing to each other political independence and territorial integrity, but it is understood between them that such territorial readjustment, if any, as may in the future become necessary by reason of changes in present racial conditions and aspirations or present social and political relationships, pursuant to the principle of self-determination, and also such territorial readjustments as may, in the judgment of three-fourths of the delegates, be demanded by the welfare and manifest interest of the peoples concerned, may be effected if agreeable to those peoples, and that territorial changes may in equity involve material compensation. The contracting powers accept without reservation the principle that the peace of the world is superior in importance to every question of political jurisdiction or boundary.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PHELAN. I would rather save my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I just want to ask the Senator if that is still in the treaty?

Mr. PHELAN. Will the Senator allow me to conclude? Then I will answer.

The President brought that to Paris. It was an American doctrine, and it is unfortunate, in my judgment, that it is not embodied in the treaty and in the covenant of the league; but it will be proposed here before we get through with these reservations, and the Senate will have an opportunity of reasserting this American doctrine. I proposed here in November that the 14 points, embodying self-determination as their cardinal feature, should be inserted in the treaty as a means by which its provisions could be interpreted; and that, unfortunately, I must admit, was voted down. I see, therefore, in this body as at present organized, a reactionary trend, but it is not too late to set ourselves right in the light of history and in the political arena of the world, and retrogression now might be very serious to free nations that rely upon and look to us, at any rate, for our moral support.

There was put into the RECORD yesterday a letter from Mr. Hoover, which indicated that we might properly keep out of certain commissions that are organized in Europe to carry out the provisions of the treaty of peace. In California on October

2, 1919, he made a statement before the Stanford University. That was several months after he had delivered to the President in Paris the memorandum dated April, 1919. I quote him now as of October, 1919. He says, among other things:

> We have been the center and inspiration of democracy for a hundred years. We have given our sympathy and encouragement to every aspiration for self-government in all this time. We have, from our experience in its blessings, believed it made for peace and well-being. We enjoy from it the highest standard of living in the world. We went to Europe with our best blood and our treasure, and fought the attempt to impose autocracy on the world. We won. We imposed democracy all over Europe. We set up a score of new democracies, and there are in many of them peoples of our own blood, in the Baltic, Polish, and Slav races. Are we to refuse our counsels to those peoples now struggling to realize—

What? He says—

> Our own ideals.

Our greatest ideal is the ideal which we have always possessed, the right of self-government. It is the inspiration of our political life, and we have gone abroad, and according to the President and according to Mr. Hoover—a political leader of the first magnitude, I judge, from the way his words are received—and we have given it to Europe, and here in the Senate it is proposed to obliterate it from the record, to strike it out, which can not but put us in a position of saying that after a hundred and fifty years our ideal is of no value; that we have been simply indulging in a pretense and a deception when we invited the peoples of the world to adopt democracy, which is self-determination, and promised to give them our support.

* * * * * * *

The Lodge amendment to strike out the words "the principle of self-determination" was defeated by a record vote of 42 to 37.

* * * * * * *

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator seeks to insert in the reservation the words "as heretofore applied by the United States." That is, he wants to limit the reservation so that we do not declare for the principle of self-determination as it is to be but as it has been under the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and I think that is the best example of self-determination the world has ever seen.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator know that that is an appeal to the past, applying the rule of the past, when we are now at the dawn of a new era?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have heard that stated, Mr. President, but——

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator know that this League of Nations is the proclamation of the new era; and is he not willing to take the new era, with all its benefits, without going back to the dead past to find the rule by which we are to act during the sunshine of this new day?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. President. I was about to yield the floor, but I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. May I ask the Senator if he will accept an amendment reading "as heretofore understood and applied by the United States"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my recollection of our history is that, as we have understood it, we have applied it. Will not the word "applied" cover everything that the Senator needs? Why make it more difficult to understand by putting in other words?

Mr. PHELAN. I have a specific purpose; otherwise I would not have suggested it. Does the Senator see any objection to using the words "as understood and applied"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I think it adds confusion.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator refuses.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. LODGE. What authority is there to state how we have understood it? There is nothing except our actions that will show how we have understood it.

Mr. PHELAN. I will reveal now what I had in mind.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That will be very interesting.

Mr. PHELAN. I refer to the Declaration of Independence—"that all men are created equal" and "endowed with certain inalienable rights," and in order "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and, therefore, if we put in here the words "understood and applied," we will be reaffirming the Declaration of Independence. I think that should be acceptable to any American Senator.

* * * * * * *

The Gerry reservation, declaring for the principle of self-determination, without change, was finally adopted by a record vote of 45 to 38, as follows:

In consenting to the ratification of the treaty with Germany the United States adheres to the principle of self-determination and to the resolution of sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of their own choice adopted by the Senate June 6, 1919, and declares that when such government is attained by Ireland, a consummation it is hoped is at hand, it should promptly be admitted as a member of the League of Nations.

174457—20714

○

1999/005